



CALIFORNIA

High-Speed Rail Authority

April 22, 2011

Mr. Zachary Simmons
Regulatory Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1325 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ms. Jennifer Bonn
High-Speed Rail, NEPA Lead
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, CED-2
San Francisco, CA 94015

Dear Mr. Simmons and Ms. Bonn:

This letter summarizes the California High-Speed Train, Merced to Fresno section, Checkpoint B revisions and submittal package. The original package was submitted on January 6, 2011, and was discussed with Authority, FRA, USEPA and USACE staff, on January 28, 2011, March 14, 2011, and March 18, 2011.

Enclosed is a Draft Checkpoint B Summary Report. This document has been updated to address USEPA and USACE requests, including more data and detail on what alternatives were considered and why several were eliminated from further study and agricultural resources impacts. The Summary Report also includes:

- EPA and USACE concurrence letters, which were part of the original January 6, 2011, submittal package.
- An Environmental Resources and Constraints Annotated Slide Presentation, which tells the story about how the alternatives have evolved and the analyses that have occurred through the evaluation process. This presentation augments the project background, which describes the trade-offs associated with the technical demands of building and operating the HST project, stakeholders' and community groups' concerns, and balancing the natural environment. The key message from this process is that stakeholders, technicians, and environmental agency representatives have reconfirmed their commitment to remaining adjacent to existing transportation facilities to the extent possible – in keeping with the project purpose and need.
- In response to the EPA's request, a technical memo describing aquatic sites and Waters of the United States potentially affected provides supporting information about the location of U.S. waters that may be crossed and potentially affected by the study alternatives. The memo concludes that based on preliminary findings, U.S. waters may not overly influence the screening of study alternatives.
- Modified Section 404 (b) (1) Alternatives Analysis Evaluation Tables, to include more detail information about agricultural impacts based on the alternatives considered.

Since the preliminary and supplemental Alternative Analysis reports have not been modified, this package does not include a resubmittal of these documents.

We would appreciate your review of this package by Wednesday, May 4. As you recall, we would like to complete Checkpoint B and obtain your concurrence as soon as possible.

Board Members:

Curt Pringle
Chair

Thomas Umberg
Vice-Chair

Lynn Schenk
Vice-Chair

Robert Balgenorth

Russell Burns

David Crane

Thomas Richards

Matthew Toledo

Roelof van Ark
CEO

JERRY BROWN
GOVERNOR



Should you have questions, please contact Bryan Porter at (916) 384-9522 or via email at porter@pbworld.com.

Sincerely,



Dan Leavitt
Deputy Director, CHSRA

Enclosures

Checkpoint B Meeting Summary, March 14, 2011

Attachment 1-1: USEPA Letter to FRA, Identification of Most Likely LEDPA, Bay Area to Central Valley Program EIS, April 30, 2008

Attachment 1-2: USACE Letter to FRA, Identification of Most Likely LEDPA, Bay Area to Central Valley Program EIS, May 8, 2008

Attachment 2: NEPA/404 Checkpoint B Presentation, April 2011

Attachment 3: Memo on Aquatic Sites and Waters of the U.S. Potentially Affected by Alternatives Considered. Includes 11 x 17-inch study maps.

Attachment 4: Preliminary 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis, Merced to Fresno Section Comparison Tables

cc: David Valenstein and Melissa DuMond, FRA
Connell Dunning, USEPA
Veronica Chan, Los Angeles District, USACE
Ann Koby and Peter Valentine, CHSRA PMT